

2009. 7. 23

123

BOUNDING RELATIVE ENTROPY BY THE RELATIVE ENTROPY OF LOCAL SPECIFICATIONS IN PRODUCT SPACES

KATALIN MARTON

Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences

ABSTRACT. For a class of density functions $q^n(x^n)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ we prove an inequality between relative entropy and the sum of average conditional relative entropies of the following form: For any density function $p^n(x^n)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$,

$$D(p^n || q^n) \leq \text{Const.} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} D(p_i(\cdot | Y_1, \dots, Y_{i-1}, Y_{i+1}, \dots, Y_n) || Q_i(\cdot | Y_1, \dots, Y_{i-1}, Y_{i+1}, \dots, Y_n)),$$

where $p_i(\cdot | y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n)$ and $Q_i(\cdot | x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$ denote the local specifications for p^n resp. q^n , i.e., the conditional density functions of the i 'th coordinate, given the other coordinates. The constant depends on the properties of the local specifications of q^n .

The above inequality implies a logarithmic Sobolev inequality for q^n . We get an explicit lower bound for the logarithmic Sobolev constant of q^n under the assumptions that:

- (i) the local specifications of q^n satisfy logarithmic Sobolev inequalities with constants ρ_i , and
- (ii) they also satisfy some condition expressing that the mixed partial derivatives of the Hamiltonian of q^n are not too large relative to the logarithmic Sobolev constants ρ_i .

Condition (ii) may be weaker than that used in Otto and Reznikoff's recent paper on the estimation of logarithmic Sobolev constants of spin systems.

¹This work was supported in part by the grants OTKA T068258 and 76088 of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences

²AMS 2000 subject classifications: 52A40, 60K35, 82B20, 82C22.

³Key words and phrases: Relative entropy, non-compact spin systems, weakly dependent random variables, logarithmic Sobolev inequality, transportation cost inequality.

1.1 The result

Let $(\mathcal{X}, d)$ be a Polish space where we shall work with the Borel σ -algebra. Let $\mathcal{X}^n$ denote the n -th power of the Borel space $(\mathcal{X}, d)$, considered with the Borel σ -algebra. Let us fix a probability measure on $\mathcal{X}^n$, given by the density

$$q^n(x^n) = (\exp(-V(x^n))) \quad (\text{with respect to some product measure } \lambda^n = \prod \lambda_i).$$

In the sequel we shall not distinguish between probability measures and their densities.

We shall use the following

Notation:

- For $x^n = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{X}^n$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$,
 $\bar{x}_i = (x_j : j \neq i)$, $x^i = (x_j : j \leq i)$, $x_i^n = (x_j : i < j \leq n)$;
- q^n : a fixed probability measure on $\mathcal{X}^n$;
- X^n : random sequence in $\mathcal{X}^n$, $\text{dist}(X^n) = q^n$;
- p^n : another density function on $\mathcal{X}^n$;
- $Y^n = Y^n(1)$: random sequence in $\mathcal{X}^n$, $\text{dist}(Y^n) = p^n$;
- $p_i(\cdot | \bar{y}_i) = \text{dist}(Y_i | \bar{Y}_i = \bar{y}_i)$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) : conditional density functions consistent with p^n ;
- $\bar{p}_i := \text{dist}(\bar{Y}_i)$, $p^i = \text{dist}(Y^i)$, $p_i^n(\cdot | y^i) = \text{dist}(Y_i^n | Y^i = y^i)$.
- $Q_i(x_i | \bar{x}_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ the local $\bar{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}^{n-1}$: the local specifications of q^n : $Q_i(\cdot | \bar{x}_i) = \text{dist}(X_i | \bar{X}_i = \bar{x}_i)$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$).

Definition. For measures p and Q on $\mathcal{X}$, we denote by $D(p||Q)$ the relative entropy (called also informational divergence) of p with respect to Q :

$$D(p||Q) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \log \frac{dp(x)}{dQ(x)} dp(x) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \log p(x) \frac{p(x)}{Q(x)} d\lambda(x) \quad (1.1)$$

if $p \ll Q$, and ∞ otherwise. If Y and X are random variables with values in $\mathcal{X}$ and distributions p resp. Q , then we shall also use the notation $D(Y||X)$ for the relative entropy $D(p||Q)$. Formula (1.1), with $\mathcal{X}$ replaced by $\mathcal{X}^n$, defines relative entropy $D(p^n||q^n)$ for measures p^n, q^n on $\mathcal{X}^n$.

To formulate the main result of this paper, we also need the concept of average (conditional) relative entropy:

Notation. If we are given a probability measure $\pi = \text{dist}(U)$ and conditional distributions $p(\cdot|U = u) = \text{dist}(Y|U = u)$, $q(\cdot|u) = \text{dist}(X|U = u)$ then for the average relative entropy

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi D(Y|U = u \| X|U = u)$$

we shall use either of the notations

$$D(Y|U \| X|U), \quad D(p(\cdot|U) \| X|U), \quad D(Y|U \| q(\cdot|U)), \quad D(p(\cdot|U) \| q(\cdot|U)).$$

Our goal is to prove an inequality of the form

$$D(p^n \| q^n) \leq c(q^n) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n D(p_i(\cdot|\bar{Y}_i) \| Q_i(\cdot|\bar{Y}_i)) \quad (1.2)$$

for a fixed measure q^n , and any p^n , under some conditions of weak dependence to be specified later. Here $c(q^n)$ denotes a constant depending on q^n , but not on p^n . I.e., we want to bound $D(p^n \| q^n)$ by the sum of the “single phase” conditional entropies $D(p_i(\cdot|\bar{Y}_i) \| Q_i(\cdot|\bar{Y}_i))$. Since $D(p_i(\cdot|\bar{Y}_i) \| Q_i(\cdot|\bar{Y}_i))$ measures in a way how different the conditional distributions $(p_i(\cdot|\bar{y}_i))$ and $Q_i(\cdot|\bar{y}_i)$ are, we can conclude from the closeness of local specifications to closeness of p^n and q^n . Moreover, such an inequality ensures that upper bounds for the “single phase” relative entropies $D(p_i(\cdot|\bar{y}_i) \| Q_i(\cdot|\bar{y}_i))$ that hold uniformly in $\bar{y}_i$ yield a bound for $D(p^n \| q^n)$. This is a way to get logarithmic Sobolev inequalities for measures on product spaces.

Note that there does not hold any inequality of type (1.2) in general.

To state the appropriate conditions for (1.2) we need the concept of quadratic Wasserstein distance.

Definition. The quadratic Wasserstein distance, or W -distance, between the probability measures p and Q on $\mathcal{X}$ is defined as

$$W(p, q) = \inf_{\pi} [E_{\pi} d^2(Y, X)]^{1/2},$$

where Y and X are random variables with laws p resp. Q , and infimum is taken over all distributions $\pi = \text{dist}(Y, X)$ with marginals p and Q .

Definition. We say that the distribution Q on $\mathcal{X}$ satisfies a distance-entropy inequality with constants ρ_i if

$$W^2(p, Q) \leq \frac{2}{\rho} D(p \| Q) \quad (1.3)$$

for all probability measures p on $\mathcal{X}$.

Distance-divergence inequalities were introduced by Marton [M1], [M2], [M3] for the case of the (non-quadratic) Wasserstein distance derived from Hamming distance. For the quadratic Wasserstein distance derived from Euclidean distance the first distance-divergence inequality was proved by Talagrand [T], for Gaussian distributions. It was generalized by Otto and Villani [O-V] for measures satisfying a classical logarithmic Sobolev inequality. Otto and Villani's paper (and Villani's book [V]), called the attention to the deep connection between quadratic distance-divergence inequalities and logarithmic Sobolev inequalities which also plays a role in the present paper.

Throughout this paper we consider measures $q^n(x^n) = \exp(-V(x^n))$ whose i -th local specification satisfies a distance-divergence inequality with constant ρ_i .

With these numbers ρ_i in mind, we shall consider the following distance on $\mathcal{X}^n$:

$$d^{(n)}(x^n, y^n) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i \cdot d(x_i, y_i)^2}, \quad x^n, y^n \in \mathcal{X}^n.$$

Now we formulate the conditions we need to derive an inequality of form (1.1) for the measure $q^n = \exp(-V(x^n))$.

Definition.

We say that the system of local specifications of the probability measure $q^n(x^n) = \exp(-V(x^n))$ satisfies the distance-entropy bound with constants ρ_i if: For every i , any sequence $\bar{y}_i$ and any density function r on $\mathcal{X}$

$$W^2(r, Q_i(\cdot|\bar{y}_i)) \leq \frac{2}{\rho_i} D(r||Q_i(\cdot|\bar{y}_i)). \quad (1.3 \text{ (DE)})$$

To formulate the second condition, fix a sequence $\zeta^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$, and define the functions Φ_ζ , $\Psi = \Psi^\zeta : (\mathcal{X}^n)^2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Phi_\zeta(t^n, y^n) = \sum_{i=1}^n V(\zeta^{i-1}, t_i, y_i^n),$$

and

$$\Psi^\zeta(t^n, y^n) = \sum_{i=1}^n V(y^{i-1}, t_i, \zeta_i^n),$$

Definition.

We say that the density function $q^n(x^n) = \exp(-V(x^n))$ satisfies the sub-quadratic bounds with constants ρ_i and δ if for every quintuple $(\zeta^n, t^n, u^n, y^n, z^n) \in (\mathcal{X}^n)^5$

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi_\zeta(t^n, y^n) - \Phi_\zeta(t^n, z^n) - \Phi_\zeta(u^n, y^n) + \Phi_\zeta(u^n, z^n) \\ & \leq \frac{1-\delta}{2} \cdot d^{(n)}(t^n, u^n) \cdot d^{(n)}(y^n, z^n), \end{aligned} \quad (1.4(\text{SQ1}))$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi^\zeta(t^n, y^n) - \Psi^\zeta(t^n, z^n) - \Psi^\zeta(u^n, y^n) + \Psi^\zeta(u^n, z^n) \\ & \leq \frac{1-\delta}{2} \cdot d^{(n)}(t^n, u^n) \cdot d^{(n)}(y^n, z^n), \end{aligned} \quad (1.5(\text{SQ2}))$$

With a less compact notation (1.6(SQ1)) and (1.6(SQ2)) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n [V(\zeta^{i-1}, t_i, y_i^n) - V(\zeta^{i-1}, t_i, z_i^n) - V(\zeta^{i-1}, u_i, y_i^n) + V(\zeta^{i-1}, u_i, z_i^n)] \\ & \leq \frac{1-\delta}{2} \cdot d^{(n)}(t^n, u^n) \cdot d^{(n)}(y^n, z^n), \end{aligned} \quad (1.6(\text{SQ1}))$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n [V(y^{i-1}, t_i, \zeta_i^n) - V(z^{i-1}, t_i, \zeta_i^n) - V(y^{i-1}, u_i, \zeta_i^n) + V(z^{i-1}, u_i, \zeta_i^n)] \\ & \leq \frac{1-\delta}{2} \cdot d^{(n)}(t^n, u^n) \cdot d^{(n)}(y^n, z^n). \end{aligned} \quad (1.7(\text{SQ2}))$$

We shall use the following comprehensive short-hand

Notation.

The probability measure $q^n(x^n) = \exp(-V(x^n))$ satisfies condition $DE(\rho_i) \& SQ(\rho_i, \delta)$ (distance-entropy & sub-quadratic bounds) if the distance-entropy and the sub-quadratic bounds hold with constants ρ_i and δ .

Our main result is

Theorem 1.

Assume that the local specifications $Q_i(\cdot | \bar{x}_i)$ satisfy conditions $DE(\rho_i) \& SQ(\rho_i, \delta)$. Then

$$D(p^n || q^n) \leq \left(\frac{1}{\delta \cdot (1 - \delta/2)} \right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n D(p_i(\cdot | \bar{Y}_i) || Q_i(\cdot | \bar{Y}_i)) \quad (1.8)$$

for any probability distribution p^n on $\mathcal{X}^n$.

We believe that Theorem 1 is true without the factor $1 - \delta/2$ in the denominator:

Conjecture.

If the local specifications $Q_i(\cdot|\bar{x}_i)$ satisfy conditions $DE(\rho_i)$ & $SQ(\rho_i, \delta)$ then

$$D(p^n||q^n) \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n D(p_i(\cdot|\bar{Y}_i)||Q_i(\cdot|\bar{Y}_i)).$$

By Theorem 1, any upper bound for the “single phase” relative entropies $D(p_i(\cdot|\bar{y}_i)||Q_i(\cdot|\bar{y}_i))$ that holds uniformly in $\bar{y}_i$, yields a bound for $D(p^n||q^n)$. This is a way to get logarithmic Sobolev inequalities for weakly dependent random variables.

1.2 Classical logarithmic Sobolev inequalities.

If p^n and q^n are probability measures on the same Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$ then $I(p^n||q^n)$ will denote the Fisher information of p^n with respect to q^n :

$$I(p^n||q^n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left| \nabla \log \frac{p^n(x^n)}{q^n(x^n)} \right|^2 p^n(x^n) d\lambda^n(x^n), \quad \text{if } \log \frac{p^n(x)}{q^n(x)} \text{ is smooth } p^n\text{-a.e..}$$

Definition. The density function q^n satisfies a classical logarithmic Sobolev inequality with constant $\rho > 0$ if for any density function p^n on $\mathbb{R}^n$, with $\log(p^n/q^n)$ smooth p^n -a.e.,

$$D(p^n||q^n) \leq \frac{1}{2\rho} I(p^n||q^n).$$

The classical logarithmic Sobolev inequality for q^n can be used to control the rate of convergence to equilibrium for the diffusion semigroup associated with q^n , and is equivalent to the hypercontractivity of this semigroup. The prototype is Gross’ logarithmic Sobolev inequality for Gaussian measure which is associated with the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup [Gr], [N]. Another use of logarithmic Sobolev inequalities is to derive transportation cost inequalities, a tool to prove measure concentration (F. Otto, C. Villani [O-V]). The classical logarithmic Sobolev inequality for spin systems is equivalent to the property called “exponential decay of correlation”; for this concept we refer to Bodineau and Helffer [B-H] and Helffer [H].

In this subsection we apply Theorem 1 to prove a logarithmic Sobolev inequality for measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with positive density

$$q^n(x^n) = \text{dist}(X^n) = \exp(-V(x^n)), \quad x^n \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

under the assumption that the local specifications

$$Q_i(\cdot|x_j, j \neq i) = \text{dist}(X_i|\bar{X}_i = \bar{x}_i)$$

satisfy logarithmic Sobolev inequalities with constants ρ_i independent of x^n , together with some other condition expressing that the mixed partial derivatives of V are not too large relative to the numbers ρ_i . We want a logarithmic Sobolev constant independent of n .

Much work has been done on this subject. The first results were obtained for spin systems with finite, and somewhat later for compact, phase spaces by J-D. Deuschel and D. W. Holley [D-H], B. Zegarlinski [Z1], D. Stroock and B. Zegarlinski [S-Z1], [S-Z2], [S-Z3], L. Lu and H. T. Yau [L-Y] and others. (In the case of finite phase space another definition is needed for the Fisher information, and thus for the logarithmic Sobolev inequality.) In [S-Z3] Stroock and Zegarlinski prove equivalence between logarithmic Sobolev inequality and Dobrushin and Shlosman's strong mixing condition in the case of finite phase space. In [Z1], Zegarlinski gives an explicit bound to the logarithmic Sobolev constant, under conditions reminiscent of, but in fact quite different from, Dobrushin's uniqueness condition.

The study of the non-compact case started later. The first two essential results are combined in the next Theorem which is Bakry and Emery's celebrated convexity criterion [Ba-E], supplemented by Holley and Stroock's perturbation lemma [Ho-S]:

Theorem of Bakry and Emery + Holley and Stroock.

Let $q^n(x^n) = \exp(-V(x^n))$ be a density function on $\mathbb{R}^k$, and let V be strictly convex at ∞ , i.e., $V(x^n) = U(x^n) + K(x^n)$, where

$$\text{Hess}(U)(x^n) = (\partial_{ij}U(x^n)) \geq c \cdot I_n$$

for some $c > 0$ (with I_n the identity matrix), and $K(x^n)$ is bounded. Then q^n satisfies a logarithmic Sobolev inequality with constant ρ , depending on c and $\|K\|_\infty$:

$$\rho \geq c \cdot \exp(-4\|K\|_\infty).$$

In particular, if V is uniformly strictly convex, i.e., $\text{Hess}(V) \geq c \cdot I_n$, then $\rho \geq c$.

We also recall the very important fact that a product distribution admits a logarithmic Sobolev inequality with constant ρ , provided the factors have logarithmic Sobolev constants $\geq \rho$.

In particular, a product distribution where all factors are uniformly bounded perturbations of uniformly log-concave distributions, admits a logarithmic Sobolev inequality with a controllable constant. The simplest case beyond this is when the local specifications are uniformly bounded perturbations of uniformly log-concave distributions, but there is a weak dependence between the coordinates. This was the case investigated by B. Helffer [He], B. Helffer and Th. Bodineau [Bod-He]. (See also M. Ledoux [L2], N. Yoshida [Y] and Chapter 5 in A. Guionnet and B. Zegarlinski [Gui-Z].)

[He] and [Bod-He] prove the existence of a positive logarithmic Sobolev constant under (more or less) the conditions of Proposition 1 below. Their results do not say much about how small the mixed partial derivatives of V should be relative to the logarithmic Sobolev constants of the $Q_i(\cdot|\bar{x}_i)$'s, nor do they provide any explicit lower bound on the logarithmic Sobolev constant of q^n . Our aim at the writing of the first few versions of this paper was to improve on earlier results in this respect.

After an earlier version [M6] of the present paper was written, the paper by F. Otto and M. Reznikoff [O-R] appeared that does already contain an explicit bound for the logarithmic Sobolev constant, depending essentially on the same parameters, and this bound is tight in some cases. Later in this section, we compare their result with ours.

To formulate a sufficient condition for $DE(\rho_i) \& SQ(\rho_i, \delta)$, define the triangular function matrices B_1 and B_2 as follows: For $y^n, z^n, \eta^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ put

$$\beta_{i,k}(y^n, \eta^n, z^n) = \frac{\partial_{i,k} V(y^{i-1}, \eta_i, z_i^n)}{\sqrt{\rho_i \rho_j}},$$

and define

$$B_1(y^n, \eta^n, z^n) = (\beta_{i,k}(y^n, \eta^n, z^n))_{i < k}, \quad B_2(y^n, \eta^n, z^n) = (\beta_{i,k}(y^n, \eta^n, z^n))_{i > k}.$$

Definition. Assume that the local specifications $Q_i(\cdot|\bar{x}_i)$ satisfy logarithmic Sobolev inequalities with constants ρ_i . We say that the system of local specifications $(Q_i(\cdot|\bar{x}_i))$ satisfies the contractivity condition for partial derivatives with constants ρ_i and δ if

$$\sup_{y^n, \eta^n, z^n} \|B_j(y^n, \eta^n, z^n)\| \leq \frac{1}{2}(1 - \delta), \quad j = 1, 2. \quad (C)$$

Thus the smaller the logarithmic Sobolev constants of the local specifications, the stronger the constraint on the mixed partial derivatives.

For the important special case when the mixed partial derivatives are constants $\beta_{i,k}$, the matrices B_1, B_2 are numerical. Furthermore, we can use the following estimates: Denoting

$$\alpha_{i,k} = \frac{\sup_{x^n} |\partial_{i,k} V(x^n)|}{\sqrt{\rho_i \rho_j}},$$

and writing

$$A_1 = (\alpha_{i,k})_{i < k}, \quad A_2 = (\alpha_{i,k})_{i > k},$$

we have

$$\|B_j\| \leq \|A_j\|, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

We shall use the following short-hand

Notation.

A system of local specifications $(Q_i(\cdot|\bar{x}_i))$ satisfies condition $LSI\&C(\rho_i, \delta)$ if the local specifications $Q_i(\cdot|\bar{x}_i)$'s satisfy logarithmic Sobolev inequalities with constants ρ_i , and also the contractivity condition for partial derivatives (C) with constants ρ_i and δ .

Proposition 1.1.

The $LSI\&C(\rho_i, \delta)$ condition implies the $DE(\rho_i)\&SQ(\rho_i, \delta)$ condition, consequently

$$D(p^n||q^n) \leq \left(\frac{1}{\delta \cdot (1 - \delta/2)} \right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n D(p_i(\cdot|\bar{Y}_i)||Q_i(\cdot|\bar{Y}_i)) \quad (1.9)$$

for any probability distribution p^n on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Theorem 1 and Proposition 1.1 imply the following

Corollary.

If the local specifications $Q_i(\cdot|\bar{x}_i)$ satisfy condition $LSI\&C(\rho_i, \delta)$ then for any density p^n ,

$$D(p^n||q^n) \leq \left(\frac{1}{\delta \cdot (1 - \delta/2)} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{2\rho} I(p^n||q^n), \quad (1.10)$$

where $\rho = \min \rho_i$.

Remark. Note that (1.9) does not contain the Fisher information, so it is conceptually much simpler than (1.10).

Proof of Proposition 1.1.

The basic tool in this proof is a result by Otto and Villani [O-V], establishing a deep connection between the logarithmic Sobolev inequality and a transportation cost inequality for quadratic Wasserstein distance. It holds in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and even on manifolds, but we only need it on $\mathbb{R}$.

Theorem of Otto and Villani in dimension 1. [O-V], [B-G-L]

If the density function $q(x)$ on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfies a classical logarithmic Sobolev inequality with constant ρ then for any density p on $\mathbb{R}$

$$W^2(p, q) \leq \frac{2}{\rho} \cdot D(p||q).$$

Assume that the local specifications $Q_i(\cdot|\bar{x}_i)$ satisfy $LSI\&C(\rho_i, \delta)$. By the Otto-Villani theorem this implies the distance-entropy bound (1.3).

To verify the sub-quadratic condition, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi_\zeta(u^n, t^n) - \Phi_\zeta(v^n, t^n) - \Phi_\zeta(u^n, z^n) + \Phi_\zeta(v^n, z^n) \\ & \leq \sup \left\| \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_i \rho_j}} \partial_{u_i, t_j} \Phi_\zeta(u^n, t^n) \right)_{j>i} \right\| \cdot d^{(n)}(u^n, v^n) \cdot d^{(n)}(t^n, z^n). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\partial_{u_i, t_j} \Phi_\zeta = \partial_{i,j} V(\zeta^{i-1}, \cdot, \cdot),$$

the sub-quadratic bound (1.4(SQ1)) follows from the contractivity bound for partial derivatives. The sub-quadratic bound (1.5(SQ2)) can be proved similarly. $\square$

Otto and Reznikoff's Theorem 1 in [O-R] gives a logarithmic Sobolev inequality of form very similar to the above Corollary. They assume a contractivity bound for partial derivatives, using a matrix A defined by putting together the triangular matrices A_1 and A_2 defined above (consisting from *bounds to absolute values of mixed partial derivatives*). The Otto-Reznikoff condition may be stronger than our $LSI\&C(\rho_i, \delta)$ condition. This is the case when there are both positive and negative entries in the matrices B_j . Thus there are Gaussian distributions for which the above Corollary does apply, but the Otto-Reznikoff theorem does not. On the other hand, in some other cases the Otto-Reznikoff theorem gives a slightly better bound. This is the case for Gaussian distributions, where all the mixed partial derivatives of $V(x^n)$ are non-negative. In this case the Otto-Reznikoff bound is tight, while ours is not. If the conjecture formulated after Theorem 1 turns out to be true then it shall give a bound that is always better than Otto and Reznikoff's.

Note that Theorem 1 does not contain the Fisher information. We used this abstract form, for we hope that our method of proof might give a pattern in other settings where a different notion of Fisher information may be needed.

1.3 On the method

Our proof of the Theorem is quite different from the approach taken by Bodineau and Helffer, and also from the approach by Otto and Reznikoff.

We use a discrete time interpolation connecting the distributions p^n and q^n , which is a modification of the Gibbs sampler for q^n . It may seem somewhat artificial, but we could not find any simpler interpolation doing the job. The difficulty is that although the $LSI\&C(\rho_i, \delta)$ condition ensures contractivity of the Gibbs sampler with respect to Wasserstein distance, for the proof of Theorem 1 contractivity with respect to relative entropy would be needed. By Lemma 5.1 below we circumvent this difficulty.

In [M3, Theorem 2] (see also [M4]) we considered distributions q^n satisfying conditions similar to $LSI\&C(\rho_i, \delta)$, and proved a transportation cost inequality. In view of the Otto-Villani theorem, this is weaker than a logarithmic Sobolev inequality. But the contractivity condition for partial derivatives in [M2] is weaker and more natural than the condition in the present paper. Furthermore, in [M2??] we also considered the more general case of local specifications $Q_I(\cdot | \bar{x}_I)$, where I runs over a collection of (small) subsets of $[1, n]$, and $Q_I(\cdot | \bar{x}_I)$ is the joint conditional density function of the random variables $(X_i : i \in I)$, given the values $(X_j : j \notin I)$. We did not aim at this generality in the present paper.

1.4 On the limits of the method.

The $LSI\&C(\rho_i, \delta)$ condition depends on the system of coordinates. This is a serious drawback, although natural in the case of spin systems. Moreover, the $LSI\&C(\rho_i, \delta)$ condition also depends on the ordering of coordinates (see later).

Because of the dependence on the system of coordinates, there are important families of distributions $q^n(x^n) = \exp(-V(x^n))$ (with n growing) that admit a logarithmic Sobolev inequality (with a constant independent of n), without satisfying an $LSI\&C(\rho_i, \delta)$ condition. In fact, this is the case with many convex quadratic functions $V(x^n)$, e.g.,

$$V_0(x^n) = 1/2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 + 1/2 \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i - M \right)^2 + \text{const.}, \quad M \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{fixed.}$$

(The results by Bodineau and Helffer, and those by Otto and Reznikoff share this problem.) In a paper on conservative spin systems Landim, Panizo and Yau [L-P-Y] proved logarithmic Sobolev inequality for the following class of densities $\exp(-V(x^n))$:

$$V(x^n) = V_0(x^n) + \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(x_i),$$

where $\phi : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is bounded, and has bounded first and second derivatives. It would be nice to find a common way to prove our perturbative theorem and the theorem of Landim, Panizo and Yau [L-P-Y], but so far these two directions could not be united, and in fact [L-P-Y] has the only non-perturbative result for the non-compact case.

The definition of the δ -contractivity condition for partial derivatives is not very transparent, partly because it depends on the ordering of the index set. If the indices are nodes in a lattice in a Euclidean space, and if V is sufficiently symmetric, then the following consideration may help. The definition of the local specifications can often be extended in a natural way to infinite sequences $y = (y_i)$ indexed by the nodes of the entire (infinite) lattice. Let us consider the lexicographical ordering on the nodes (i.e., on the index set). For every node i , the symmetry with center i is a bijection between the nodes preceding resp. following i , and it often happens that if nodes j and k are interchanged by this bijection then

$$\beta_{i,j}(y, \eta, z) = \beta_{i,k}(z^*, \eta, y^*),$$

where y^* denotes the sequence defined as follows:

$$y_i^* = y_i, \quad y_k^* = y_j \quad \text{if } j \text{ and } k \text{ are interchanged by the bijection.}$$

With this ordering of the indices it is often possible to give effective bounds for $\|B_1\|$ and $\|B_2\|$.

Recently several extensions of the logarithmic Sobolev inequality were invented for generalized entropy functionals. See works by B. Zegarlinski [Z3], S. Bobkov and B. Zegarlinski [B-Z], C. Roberto and B. Zegarlinski [R-Z], F. Barthe, P. Cattiaux and C. Roberto [Bar-C-R], D. Cordero-Erausquin, W. Gangbo and C. Houdré [CE-Ga-Hou]. In these works, relative entropy and Fisher information are replaced by more general functionals. In [Z3] and [B-Z] some of these more general inequalities are also proved for Gibbs measures (without explicit bounds). At this moment it is not clear whether the methods of this paper can be extended to prove results like those in [Z3] and [B-Z].

2. An auxiliary theorem for estimating relative entropy.

In this section we prove the following

Auxiliary Theorem. *Let X^n be a random sequence with local specifications $Q_i(\cdot|\bar{x}_i)$, and let $(Y^n(t) : t = 0, 1, \dots)$ be a discrete time random process in $\mathcal{X}^n$. Then:*

(i) *For any $s \geq 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} & D(Y^n(0) \| X^n) \\ & \leq \sum_{t=0}^s \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i(t) | Y^{i-1}(t), Y_i^n(t+1) \| Q_i(\cdot | Y^{i-1}(t), Y_i^n(t+1))) \\ & + D(Y^n(s+1) \| X^n). \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

or, equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} & D(Y^n(s) \| X^n) - D(Y^n(s+1) \| X^n) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i(s) | Y^{i-1}(s), Y_i^n(s+1) \| Q_i(\cdot | Y^{i-1}(s), Y_i^n(s+1))). \end{aligned} \quad (2.1')$$

(ii) *If, in particular,*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} D(Y^n(s) \| X^n) = 0 \quad \text{along some subsequence} \quad (2.2)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} & D(Y^n(1) \| X^n) \\ & \leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i(t) | Y^{i-1}(t), Y_i^n(t+1) \| Q_i(\cdot | Y^{i-1}(t), Y_i^n(t+1))). \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

(iii) *If the sequence $(Y^n(t))$ is the Gibbs sampler, i.e., for all $t \geq 0$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$*

$$\text{dist}(Y_i(t+1) | Y^{i-1}(t) = y^{i-1}(t), Y_i^n(t+1) = y_i^n(t+1)) = Q_i(\cdot | y^{i-1}(t), y_i^n(t+1)), \quad (2.4)$$

then (2.1) holds with equality. Thus in this case

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i(t)|Y^{i-1}(t), Y_i^n(t+1) \| Q_i(\cdot|Y^{i-1}(t), Y_i^n(t+1))) \leq D(Y^n(0) \| X^n). \quad (2.5)$$

Remark 1.

A frequently used tool in bounding relative entropy is the decomposition

$$D(Y^n \| X^n) = \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i | Y^{i-1} \| q_i(\cdot | Y^{i-1})),$$

where $q_i(\cdot | y^{i-1}) = \text{dist}(X_i | X^{i-1} = y^{i-1})$. This decomposition has the drawback that $D(Y_i | Y^{i-1} \| q_i(\cdot | Y^{i-1}))$ cannot easily be bounded by a relative entropy with respect to some conditional density $Q_i(\cdot | \cdot)$. The Auxiliary Theorem bounds $D(Y^n \| X^n)$ by an infinite sum of relative entropies, all with respect to some $Q_i(\cdot | \cdot)$.

Remark 2.

For given distributions $(\text{dist}(Y^n(t)), t = 0, 1, 2, \dots)$ there are many joint distributions $\text{dist}(Y^n(t), Y^n(t+1))$. The terms in the sum (2.1) do depend on these joint distributions, but only through the joint distributions $\text{dist}(Y^i(t), Y_i^n(t+1))$.

Proof of the Auxiliary Theorem..

To prove (2.1) for $s = 0$, we iterate the following inequality: For any random sequence Y^n and random variable Z_n , with an arbitrary joint distribution,

$$D(Y^n \| X^n) \leq D(Y^n \| Y^{n-1}, Z_n) + D(Y^{n-1}, Z_n \| X^n). \quad (2.6)$$

This holds because

$$\begin{aligned} D(Y^n \| X^n) &= D(Y^{n-1} \| X^{n-1}) + D(Y_n | Y^{n-1} \| Q_n(\cdot | Y^{n-1})) \\ &\leq D(Y_n | Y^{n-1} \| Q_n(\cdot | Y^{n-1})) + D((Y^{n-1}, Z_n) \| X^n). \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

By recursion on i , (2.7) implies (2.1) for $s = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} &D(Y^n(0) \| X^n) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i(0) | Y^{i-1}(1), Y_i^n(1) \| Q_i(\cdot | Y^{i-1}(0), Y_i^n(1))) + D(Y^n(1) \| X^n). \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

From (2.8) we get (2.1) by another recursion: on s .

To prove (iii), note that if (2.4) holds then (2.7) holds with equality, and so does (2.8). $\square$

The Auxiliary Theorem is fairly easy to prove, but to use it we need a process $(Y^n(t), t = 1, 2, \dots)$ that admits good estimates for the terms in the sum (3.3), and also satisfies (3.2). The construction and analysis of such a process is the subject of the rest of the paper.

3. The Entropy-Distance inequality.

An important tool in the proof of Theorem 1 is the following notion:

Definition.

We say that the system of local specifications of q^n satisfies the entropy-distance bound with constants ρ_i and δ if:

For any quadruple of sequences $(y^n(1), y^n(2), z^n(1), z^n(2)) \in (\mathcal{X}^n)^4$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n D(Q_i(\cdot | y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2)) \| Q_i(\cdot | z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2))) \\ & \leq \frac{(1-\delta)^2}{8} \cdot [d^{(n)}(y^n(1), z^n(1)) + d^{(n)}(y^n(2), z^n(2))]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1 \text{ (ED)})$$

In this section we prove the following

Lemma 3.1.

If the system of local specifications of q^n satisfies condition $DE(\rho_i) \& SQ(\rho_i, \delta)$ then it satisfies the entropy-distance bound with the same constants.

Proof.

Define the function $F : (\mathcal{X}^n)^3 \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ by

$$F(y^n, \theta^n, u^n) = \sum_{i=1}^n V(y^{i-1}, \theta_i, u_i^n).$$

By the identity

$$\begin{aligned} & F(y^n, \theta^n, u^n) - F(z^n, \theta^n, v^n) - F(y^n, \tau^n, u^n) - F(z^n, \tau^n, v^n) \\ & = \Phi_y(\theta^n, u^n) - \Phi_y(\theta^n, v^n) - \Phi_y(\tau^n, u^n) - \Phi_y(\tau^n, v^n) \\ & + \Psi^v(\theta^n, y^n) - \Psi^v(\theta^n, z^n) - \Psi^v(\tau^n, y^n) - \Psi^v(\tau^n, z^n), \end{aligned}$$

valid for all sextuples $(y^n, z^n, u^n, v^n, \theta^n, \tau^n) \in (\mathcal{X}^n)^6$, the bounds (1.4(SQ1)) and (1.5(SQ2)) imply

$$\begin{aligned} & F(y^n, \theta^n, u^n) - F(z^n, \theta^n, v^n) - F(y^n, \tau^n, u^n) - F(z^n, \tau^n, v^n) \\ & \leq \frac{1-\delta}{2} \cdot d^{(n)}(\theta^n, \tau^n) \cdot [d^{(n)}(y^n, z^n) + d^{(n)}(u^n, v^n)]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

We also have the following series of identities:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^n D(Q_i(\cdot|y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2)) \| Q_i(\cdot|z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2))) \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^n D(Q_i(\cdot|z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2)) \| Q_i(\cdot|y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2))) \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q_i(t_i|y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2)) \cdot \log \frac{Q_i(t_i|y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2))}{Q_i(t_i|z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2))} d\lambda_i(t_i) \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q_i(t_i|z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2)) \cdot \log \frac{Q_i(t_i|z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2))}{Q_i(t_i|y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2))} d\lambda_i(t_i) \\
& = \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\log \frac{Q_i(\theta_i|y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2))}{Q_i(\theta_i|z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2))} - \log \frac{Q_i(\tau_i|y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2))}{Q_i(\tau_i|z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2))} \right], \tag{3.3}
\end{aligned}$$

where θ^n and τ^n are random sequences with independent components and distributed according to

$$\text{dist}(\theta_i) = Q_i(\cdot|y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2)), \quad \text{dist}(\tau_i) = Q_i(\cdot|z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2)).$$

By conditional independence of the coordinates, we can define the joint distribution $\text{dist}(\theta^n, \tau^n)$ so as to achieve

$$\mathbb{E}(d^{(n)})^2(\theta^n, \tau^n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i \cdot W^2(Q_i(\cdot|y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2)), Q_i(\cdot|z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2))). \tag{3.4}$$

Let us introduce the notations

$$\begin{aligned}
D_y &= \sum_{i=1}^n D(Q_i(\cdot|y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2)) \| Q_i(\cdot|z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2))), \\
D_z &= \sum_{i=1}^n D(Q_i(\cdot|z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2)) \| Q_i(\cdot|y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2))).
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\log \frac{Q_i(\theta_i|y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2))}{Q_i(\theta_i|z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2))} - \log \frac{Q_i(\tau_i|y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2))}{Q_i(\tau_i|z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2))} \right] \\
& = F(y^n(1), \theta^n, y^n(2)) - F(z^n(1), \theta^n, z^n(2)) \\
& \quad - F(y^n(1), \tau^n, y^n(2)) + F(z^n(1), \tau^n, z^n(2)),
\end{aligned}$$

(3.2), (3.3) and (3.4) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{D_y \cdot D_z} &\leq \frac{D_y + D_z}{2} \\
&\leq \frac{1 - \delta}{4} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i \cdot W^2(Q_i(\cdot | y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2)), Q_i(\cdot | z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2)))} \\
&\quad \cdot [d^{(n)}(y^n(1), z^n(1)) + d^{(n)}(y^n(2), z^n(2))]. \tag{3.5}
\end{aligned}$$

By the distance-entropy bound

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i \cdot W^2(Q_i(\cdot | y^{i-1}(1), y_i^n(2)), Q_i(\cdot | z^{i-1}(1), z_i^n(2))) \leq 2 \cdot \min\{D_y, D_z\}. \tag{3.6}$$

Substituting (3.6) into (3.5) and taking squares:

$$D_y \cdot D_z \leq \frac{(1 - \delta)^2}{8} \cdot \min\{D_y, D_z\} \cdot [d^{(n)}(y^n(1), z^n(1)) + d^{(n)}(y^n(2), z^n(2))]^2, \tag{3.7}$$

i.e.,

$$\max\{D_y, D_z\} \leq \frac{(1 - \delta)^2}{8} \cdot [d^{(n)}(y^n(1), z^n(1)) + d^{(n)}(y^n(2), z^n(2))]^2.$$

□

Note that conditions (1.3(DE)) and (3.1(ED)) imply a strong form of contractivity: For any quadruple of sequences $(y^n(1), y^n(2), z^n(1), z^n(2))$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i \cdot W^2(Q_i(\cdot | u^{i-1}(1), u_i^n(2)), Q_i(\cdot | t^{i-1}(1), t_i^n(2))) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} (1 - \delta)^2 \cdot [d^{(n)}(y^n(1), z^n(1)) + d^{(n)}(y^n(2), z^n(2))]^2. \tag{3.8 (CO)}
\end{aligned}$$

Condition (3.8(CO)) is somewhat stronger than the usual contractivity condition, which is the same thing with $y^n(1) = y^n(2)$ and $z^n(1) = z^n(2)$, and which can be considered as a version of Dobrushin's uniqueness condition [D].

It is well known that the usual contractivity condition, and thus condition (CO), implies the existence and uniqueness of a probability measure q^n compatible with the given local specifications. This will be the case throughout the paper.

4. The interpolation processes

Let us define a Markov chain

$$(Y^n(t) : t = 0, 1, \dots)$$

as follows: Let $\text{dist}(Y^n(0)) = p^n$, and define the conditional distribution $\text{dist}(Y^n(t+1)|Y^n(t))$ by the Markov kernel G , where

Definition.

The Markov operator G (on the probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$) is defined by the transition function

$$G(v^n|u^n) = \prod_{i=1}^n Q_i(v_i|v^{i-1}, u_i^n). \quad (4.1)$$

If π^n is a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ then $\pi^n \cdot G$ shall denote the image of π^n under G :

$$\pi^n \cdot G(\cdot) = \int G(\cdot|u^n) p^n(u^n) d\lambda^n(u^n).$$

Note that if a density function q^n has local specifications Q_i then it is invariant with respect to G .

Sometimes we shall denote $Y^n(0)$ by Y^n .

$(Y^n(t))$ is a variant of the Gibbs sampler for q^n . It is important that it satisfies (2.4) and, consequently, (2.5).

The inequalities (2.1) and (2.3) of the Auxiliary Theorem will be applied not to the process $(Y^n(t))$ but to the (hidden Markov) process

$$(Z^n(t) : t = 1, 2, \dots),$$

defined as follows: Let

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}(Z_i(t+1)|Y^n(t) = y^n(t), Y^n(t+1) = y^n(t+1)) \\ &= Q_i(\cdot|y^{i-1}(t), y_i^n(t+1)) \quad (t \geq 0), \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

and let

$$\text{dist}((Y_i(t), Z_i(t+1)) \mid Y^n(t) = y^n(t), Y^n(t+1) = y^n(t+1))$$

be that coupling of the distributions

$$\text{dist}(Y_i(t)|Y^{i-1}(t) = y^{i-1}(t), Y_i^n(t+1) = y_i^n(t+1)), \quad Q_i(\cdot|y^{i-1}(t), y_i^n(t+1)),$$

that achieves

$$W^2(\text{dist}(Y_i(t)|Y^{i-1}(t) = y^{i-1}(t), Y_i^n(t+1) = y_i^n(t+1)), Q_i(\cdot|y^{i-1}(t), y_i^n(t+1))) \quad (4.3)$$

for every value of the conditions. Thereby we have defined $\text{dist}(Z_i(t+1)|Y^i(t), Y_i^n(t+1))$, and we assume that

$$\begin{aligned} Z_i(t+1) &\rightarrow (Y^i(t), Y_i^n(t+1)) \\ &\rightarrow \text{everything else in the process } (Y^n(s), s \neq t, t+1) \quad \text{and} \quad (Z^n(s), s \neq t+1) \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Let us extend $\text{dist}(Y^n, Y^n(1), Y^n(2), \dots)$ to $\text{dist}(Y'^n, Y^n, Y^n(1), Y^n(2), \dots)$ as follows. We define $\text{dist}(Y'^n, Y^n)$ so that

$$\text{dist}(Y'^i, Y_i^n) = p^n \quad \text{for all } i, \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$Y'_i \rightarrow (Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n) \rightarrow Y^i. \quad (4.6)$$

It is easy to see by recursion that this can be done. (Indeed, if for some i $\text{dist}(Y'^{i-1}, Y^n)$ is already defined then we define $\text{dist}(Y'^i, Y^n)$ by relations

$$\text{dist}(Y'_i|Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n) = p_i(\cdot|Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n) \quad \text{and} \quad Y'_i \rightarrow (Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n) \rightarrow Y^i.)$$

We shall apply the Auxiliary Theorem to the sequence

$$(Y'^n(0), Z^n(1), Z^n(2), \dots, Z^n(t), \dots).$$

(It is easier to deal with the joint distribution $\text{dist}(Y'^n, Z^n(1))$ than with $\text{dist}(Y^n, Z^n(1))$. Note that $Y'^n \rightarrow Y^n \rightarrow Z^n(1)$.)

In order to use the Auxiliary Theorem for the process $(Z^n(t))$, we need good bounds for

$$D_t = \sum_{i=1}^n D(Z_i(t)|Z^{i-1}(t), Z_i^n(t+1)||Q_i(\cdot|Z^{i-1}(t), Z_i^n(t+1))), \quad t \geq 1 \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$D_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y'_i|Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1)||Q_i(\cdot|Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))), \quad (4.8)$$

and need to prove that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} D(Z^n(t)||q^n) = 0. \quad (4.9)$$

We shall bound D_t by E_t , the counterpart of D_t for the process $(Y^n(t))$:

$$E_t = \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i(t)|Y^{i-1}(t), Y_i^n(t+1)||Q_i(\cdot|Y^{i-1}(t), Y_i^n(t+1))), \quad t \geq 0 \quad (4.10)$$

and exploit that by (iii) of the Auxiliary Theorem

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} E_t \leq D(Y^n||X^n). \quad (4.11)$$

5. Bounding D_t by E_t .

Lemma 5.1. *Under the $DE(\rho_i)$ & $ED(\rho_i, \delta)$ condition*

$$D_t \leq \frac{(1-\delta)^2}{2} \cdot (E_{t-1} + E_t) \quad \text{for } t \geq 1. \quad (5.1)$$

Consequently,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} D_t \leq (1-\delta)^2 \cdot (E_0/2 + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} E_t) \leq (1-\delta)^2 \cdot (D(Y^n||X^n) - E_0/2). \quad (5.2)$$

Remark 1. We could not prove a recursion formula ensuring exponential decrease for either of the sequences (D_t) , (E_t) . But Lemma 5.1 is a good replacement, in force of the upper bound (2.5): $\sum -0^\infty E_t \leq D(Y^n||X^n)$.

Remark 2. In the next section we prove that $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} D(Z^n(s)||X^n) = 0$. Anticipating this convergence, (5.2), together with the Auxiliary Theorem, implies that

$$D(Y^n||X^n) \leq D_0 + (1-\delta)^2 \cdot (D(Y^n||X^n) - E_0/2),$$

i.e.,

$$(1 - (1-\delta)^2) \cdot D(Y^n||X^n) \leq D_0 - \frac{(1-\delta)^2}{2} \cdot E_0. \quad (5.3)$$

For the proof of (5.1) we introduce the following

Notation. Let (T, U, V) be a triple of random variables. We write

$$T \rightarrow U \rightarrow V$$

to express the Markov relation

$$T \quad \text{and} \quad V \quad \text{are conditionally independent given } U.$$

Using the above notation we state

Lemma 5.2.

$$Y_i(t) \rightarrow (Y^{i-1}(t), Y_i^n(t+1)) \rightarrow Y^i(t+1) \quad \text{for all } t \quad \text{and } i. \quad (5.4)$$

Lemma 5.2 follows at once from the definition of the Markov chain $(Y^n(t))$.

Moreover, we need a generalization of conditional relative entropy:

Notation.

If Y and X are random variables with values in the same space, and distributions p resp. q , then $D(Y\|X)$ will denote the relative entropy $D(p\|q)$. Moreover, if we are given the conditional distributions $p(\cdot|V = v) = \text{dist}(Y|V = v)$, $q(\cdot|u) = \text{dist}(X|U = u)$ and the joint distribution $\pi = \text{dist}(U, V)$, then for the average relative entropy

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi D(Y|V = v\|X|U = u)$$

we shall use either of the notations

$$D(Y|U\|X|V), \quad D(p(\cdot|V)\|X|U), \quad D(Y|U)\|q(\cdot|V)), \quad D(p(\cdot|U)\|q(\cdot|V)).$$

Proof of Lemma 5.1.

To prove (5.1), we are going to prove (later) and use now the following Markov relation:

$$Z_i(t) \rightarrow (Y^{i-1}(t-1), Y_i^n(t)) \rightarrow (Z^{i-1}(t), Z_i^n(t+1)) \quad \text{all } t \geq 1 \quad \text{and all } i. \quad (5.5)$$

Remark. The Markov relation (5.5) and its application (5.6) (below) are crucial in bounding D_t , and thereby in the proof of Theorem 1.

Relation (5.5) implies, by the convexity of the entropy functional, that for all $t \geq 1$ and all i

$$\begin{aligned} & D(Z_i(t)|Z^{i-1}(t), Z_i^n(t+1)\|Q_i(\cdot|Z^{i-1}(t), Z_i^n(t+1))) \\ & \leq D(Z_i(t)|Y^{i-1}(t-1), Y_i^n(t)\|Q_i(\cdot|Z^{i-1}(t), Z_i^n(t+1))) \\ & = D(Q_i(\cdot|Y^{i-1}(t-1), Y_i^n(t))\|Q_i(\cdot|Z^{i-1}(t), Z_i^n(t+1))). \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} D_t & \leq \sum_{i=1}^n D(Q_i(\cdot|Y^{i-1}(t-1), Y_i^n(t))\|Q_i(\cdot|Z^{i-1}(t), Z_i^n(t+1))) \\ & \leq \frac{(1-\delta)^2}{8} \cdot \mathbb{E}[d^{(n)}(Y^n(t-1), Z^n(t)) + d^{(n)}(Y^n(t), Z^n(t+1))]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where the second inequality follows from the entropy-distance bound (3.1(ED)).

By the distance-entropy inequality this implies

$$\begin{aligned}
D_t &\leq \frac{(1-\delta)^2}{4} \\
&\cdot \left[\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i(t-1)|Y^{i-1}(t-1), Y_i^n(t)) \|Q(\cdot|Y^{i-1}(t-1), Y_i^n(t))\|} \right. \\
&+ \left. \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i(t)|Y^{i-1}(t), Y_i^n(t+1)) \|Q(\cdot|Y^{i-1}(t), Y_i^n(t+1))\|} \right]^2 \\
&= \frac{(1-\delta)^2}{4} \cdot [\sqrt{E_{t-1}} + \sqrt{E_t}]^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We still have to prove the Markov relation (5.5). This will be proved as soon as we have shown that

$$Y_i(t-1) \rightarrow (Y^{i-1}(t-1), Y_i^n(t)) \rightarrow (Z^{i-1}(t), Z_i^n(t+1)). \quad (5.8)$$

By Lemma 4.1, for (5.8) it is enough to prove that

$$Y_i(t-1) \rightarrow (Y^{i-1}(t-1), Y^n(t)) \rightarrow (Z^{i-1}(t), Z_i^n(t+1)). \quad (5.9)$$

Relation

$$Y_i(t-1) \rightarrow (Y^{i-1}(t-1), Y^n(t)) \rightarrow Z^{i-1}(t)$$

follows from (4.8). Relation

$$Y_i(t-1) \rightarrow (Y^{i-1}(t-1), Y^n(t), Z^{i-1}(t)) \rightarrow Z_i^n(t+1)$$

follows from the Markov relation

$$Y^n(t-1) \rightarrow Y^n(t) \rightarrow Y^n(t+1) \rightarrow Y^n(t+2),$$

together with (4.8). Now (5.3), and thus the bound (5.1) is proved, and (5.2) follows using (4.11). $\square$

6. Bounding $D_0 - (1 - \delta)^2/2 \cdot E_0$.

Recall that

$$D_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1) || Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))),$$

and

$$E_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i | Y^{i-1}, Y_i^n(1) || Q_i(\cdot | Y^{i-1}, Y_i^n(1))),$$

where $Y^n = Y^n(0)$, and Y'^n was defined by (4.5) and (4.6).

Lemma 6.1.

$$D_0 - \frac{(1 - \delta)^2}{2} \cdot E_0 \leq 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i(\cdot | \bar{Y}_i) || Q_i(\cdot | \bar{Y}_i)). \quad (6.1)$$

(Recall that $Y^n = Y^n(0)$.)

Proof.

By (4.5), and since $Y'^n \rightarrow Y^n \rightarrow Z^n(1)$, we have

$$Y'_i \rightarrow (Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n) \rightarrow (Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1)),$$

whence

$$D(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1) || Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))) \leq D(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n || Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))). \quad (6.2)$$

It is easy to check that the following identity holds true:

$$\begin{aligned} & D(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n || Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))) \\ &= D(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n || Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)) + D(Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n) || Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))) \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \int p_i(y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n) \cdot \log \frac{Q_i(y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)}{Q_i(y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))} d\lambda_i(y'_i) \\ &- \mathbb{E} \int Q_i(y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n) \cdot \log \frac{Q_i(y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)}{Q_i(y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))} d\lambda_i(y'_i). \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

The expectation in the last two lines is with respect to $\text{dist}(Y'^n, Y^n, Z^n(1))$.

The last two lines in (6.3) can be respectively written in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \int p_i(y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n) \cdot \log \frac{Q_i(y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)}{Q_i(y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))} d\lambda_i(y'_i) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \log \frac{Q_i(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)}{Q_i(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \int Q_i(y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n) \cdot \log \frac{Q_i(y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)}{Q_i(y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))} d\lambda_i(y'_i) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \log \frac{Q_i(\tau_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)}{Q_i(\tau_i | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

where the expectation is with respect to $\text{dist}(Y'^n, Y^n, Z^n(1), \tau^n)$. The conditional distribution $\text{dist}(\tau_i | Y'^n, Y^n, Z^n(1))$ is defined by the conditions

$$\text{dist}(\tau_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n) = Q_i,$$

and

$$\text{dist}(Y'_i, \tau_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)$$

is that coupling of

$$\text{dist}(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n) \quad \text{and} \quad Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)$$

that achieves W^2 -distance for all values of the conditions. Thereby we have defined $\text{dist}(\tau_i | Y'^i, Y_i^n)$ and we assume that

$$\tau_i \rightarrow (Y'^i, Y_i^n) \rightarrow \text{everything else in } (Y'^n, Y^n, Z^n(1), \tau^n).$$

Putting together (6.2-6.5):

$$\begin{aligned} & D(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1) || Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))) \\ & \leq D(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n || Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)) + D(Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n) || Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))) \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left[\log \frac{Q_i(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)}{Q_i(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))} - \log \frac{Q_i(\tau_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)}{Q_i(\tau_i | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))} \right] \\ & = D(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n || Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)) + D(Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n) || Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))) \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left[V(Y'^i, Y_i^n) - V(Y'^i, Z_i^n(1)) - V(Y'^{i-1}, \tau_i, Y_i^n) + V(Y'^{i-1}, \tau_i, Z_i^n(1)) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Summing for i :

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n || Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n || Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^n D(Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n) || Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Z_i^n(1))) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[V(Y'^i, Y_i^n) - V(Y'^i, Z_i^n(1)) - V(Y'^{i-1}, \tau_i, Y_i^n) + V(Y'^{i-1}, \tau_i, Z_i^n(1)) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

By the $DE(\rho_i) \& SQ(\rho_i, \delta)$ condition (6.6) can be continued to

$$\begin{aligned} D_0 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n \| Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)) + \frac{(1-\delta)^2}{8} \cdot \mathbb{E}(d^{(n)})^2(Y^n, Z^n(1)) \\ &+ \frac{1-\delta}{2} \cdot \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(d^{(n)})^2(Y^n, Z^n(1))} \cdot \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(d^{(n)})^2(Y'^n, \tau^n)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

By the definition of Y'^n (4.5) we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n D(Y'_i | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n \| Q_i(\cdot | Y'^{i-1}, Y_i^n)) = \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i | Y^{i-1}, Y_i^n \| Q_i(\cdot | Y^{i-1}, Y_i^n)). \quad (6.8)$$

Moreover, by the definition of τ^n , together with the distance-entropy bound (1.3(DE)) and (4.5):

$$\mathbb{E}(d^{(n)})^2(Y'^n, \tau^n) \leq 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i | Y^{i-1}, Y_i^n \| Q_i(\cdot | Y^{i-1}, Y_i^n)). \quad (6.9)$$

Further, by definition of $Z^n(1)$ and the distance-entropy bound:

$$\mathbb{E}(d^{(n)})^2(Y^n, Z^n(1)) \leq 2 \cdot E_0. \quad (6.10)$$

Substituting (6.8-6.10) into (6.7), we get

$$\begin{aligned} D_0 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i | Y^{i-1}, Y_i^n \| Q_i(\cdot | Y^{i-1}, Y_i^n)) + \frac{(1-\delta)^2}{4} \cdot E_0 \\ &+ (1-\delta) \cdot \sqrt{E_0} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i | Y^{i-1}, Y_i^n \| Q_i(\cdot | Y^{i-1}, Y_i^n))}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} D_0 - \frac{(1-\delta)^2}{2} \cdot E_0 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i | Y^{i-1}, Y_i^n \| Q_i(\cdot | Y^{i-1}, Y_i^n)) - \frac{(1-\delta)^2}{4} \cdot E_0 \\ &+ (1-\delta) \cdot \sqrt{E_0} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n D(Y_i | Y^{i-1}, Y_i^n \| Q_i(\cdot | Y^{i-1}, Y_i^n))}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

Maximizing in E_0 the right-hand-side of (6.12) (which is quadratic in $\sqrt{E_0}$) we get (6.1) □

Substituting (6.1) into (5.3) yields (1.8), the statement of Theorem 1. But To (1.8) be valid, we still have to prove the entropy convergence (2.2).

7. Convergence in entropy

Lemma 7.1.

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} D(Z^n(t) || X^n) = 0.$$

For the proof we shall need the concept of quadratic Wasserstein distance $W(p^n, q^n) = W^\rho(p^n, q^n)$ between measures on $\mathcal{X}^n$, and the fact that the Markov operator G defined by (4.1) (and defining the Gibbs sampler $(Y^n(t))$) is a contraction with respect to this distance:

Definition.

$$W(p^n, q^n) = W^\rho(p^n, q^n) = \inf_{\pi} [E_{\pi} d^{(n)}(Y^n, X^n)^2]^{1/2},$$

where Y^n and X^n are random variables with laws p^n resp. q^n , and infimum is taken over all distributions $\pi = \text{dist}(Y^n, X^n)$ with marginals p^n and q^n . Note that the W -distance depends on the metric d and also on the numbers ρ_i (since the ρ_i 's are present in the definition of $d^{(n)}$). For $1 \leq i \leq n$ we define similarly

$$W(p_i^n, q_i^n) = W^\rho(p_i^n, q_i^n) = \inf_{\pi} [E_{\pi} \sum_{j=i+1}^n d_j^2(Y_j, X_j)]^{1/2}.$$

Lemma 7.2.

If q^n satisfies the contractivity bound (3.8(CO)) then the Markov kernel G is a contraction with respect to the W^2 -distance, with rate $r(\delta) = (1 - \delta)/(1 + 2\delta - \delta^2)^{1/2} < 1$. Consequently,

$$W^2(p^n, q^n) \leq C(\delta) \cdot r(\delta)^{2n} \cdot W^2(p^n, p^n \cdot G),$$

where $C(\delta)$ is a constant depending on δ .

Proof of Lemma 7.2.

Consider sequences $y^n, z^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$, and define the random sequences U^n, T^n with values in $\mathcal{X}^n$, and distributions

$$\text{dist}(U^n | y^n) = G(\cdot | y^n) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{dist}(T^n | z^n) = G(\cdot | z^n).$$

Define a joining $\text{dist}(U^n, T^n | y^n, z^n)$ successively by taking for

$$\text{dist}(U_i, T_i | y^n, z^n, U_i^n = u_i^n, T_i^n = t_i^n)$$

that joining of $Q_i(\cdot | y^{i-1}, u_i^n)$ and $Q_i(\cdot | z^{i-1}, t_i^n)$ that achieves W^2 -distance. Thereby we have successively defined a joining of $\text{dist}(U^n | y^n) = G(\cdot | y^n)$ and $\text{dist}(T^n | z^n) = G(\cdot | z^n)$. Let $\pi^n = \pi^n(\cdot | y^n, z^n) = \text{dist}(U^n, T^n | y^n, z^n)$ denote this joining.

We have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi^n} d^2(U_i, T_i | y^n, z^n, U_i^n = u_i^n, T_i^n = t_i^n) = W^2(Q_i(\cdot | y^{i-1}, u_i^n), Q_i(\cdot | z^{i-1}, t_i^n)).$$

Thus the contractivity condition (3.8(CO)) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi^n} (d^{(n)})^2(U^n, T^n) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\pi^n} W^2(Q_i(\cdot | y^{i-1}, U_i^n), Q_i(\cdot | z^{i-1}, T_i^n)) \\ &\leq (1 - \delta)^2 [(d^{(n)})^2(y^n, z^n) + \mathbb{E}_{\pi^n} (d^{(n)})^2(U^n, T^n)]. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms, we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi^n} (d^{(n)})^2(U^n, T^n) \leq \frac{(1 - \delta)^2}{1 + 2\delta - \delta^2} \cdot (d^{(n)})^2(y^n, z^n). \quad \square$$

Proof of Lemma 7.1.

We have

$$D(Z^n(t) || X^n) = \sum_{i=1}^n D(Z_i(t) | Z^{i-1}(t) || q_i(\cdot | Z^{i-1}(t))), \quad (7.1)$$

where $q_i(\cdot | x^{i-1}) = \text{dist}(X_i | X^{i-1} = x^{i-1})$.

Relation (5.5) implies, by the convexity of the entropy functional, that for all $t \geq 1$ and all i

$$\begin{aligned} &D(Z_i(t) | Z^{i-1}(t) || q_i(\cdot | Z^{i-1}(t))) \\ &\leq D(Z_i(t) | Y^{i-1}(t-1), Y_i^n(t) || Q_i(\cdot | Z^{i-1}(t), S_i^n(t+1))) \\ &= D(Q_i(\cdot | Y^{i-1}(t-1), Y_i^n(t) || Q_i(\cdot | Z^{i-1}(t), S_i^n(t+1))), \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

where $S_i^n(t+1)$ denotes a random sequence in $\mathcal{X}^{n-i}$, satisfying

$$\text{dist}(S_i^n(t+1) | Z^i(t) = z^i) = q_i^n(\cdot | z^i) = \text{dist}(X_i^n | X^i = z^i). \quad (7.3)$$

In order to prove that the right-most side of (7.2) tends to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$, we want to use the entropy-distance bound (3.1(ED)). Let us fix sequences $y^i, z^i \in \mathcal{X}^i$. We are going to define a coupling

$$\pi_i^n(\cdot | y^i, z^i) = \text{dist}(Y_i^n(t), S_i^n(t+1) | Y^i(t-1) = y^i, Z^i(t) = z^i)$$

of the conditional distributions

$$\text{dist}(Y_i^n(t) | Y^i(t-1) = y^i, Z^i(t) = z^i), \quad \text{and} \quad \text{dist}(S_i^n(t+1) | Z^i(t) = z^i) = q_i^n(\cdot | z^i) \quad (7.4)$$

such that

$$\int \sum_{j=i+1} \rho_j \cdot \mathbb{E} \left\{ d^2(Y_j(t), S_j(t+1)) \mid Y^i(t-1) = y^i, Z^i(t) = z^i \right\} \quad (7.5)$$

be possibly small, where integration is with respect to $\text{dist}(Y^i(t-1), Z^i(t))$

To somewhat simplify notation in the conditional distributions, we shall temporarily write y^i and z^i in place of $Y^i(t-1) = y^i$ and $Z^i(t) = z^i$.

With this notation we have to bound

$$W^2(\text{dist}(Y_i^n(t)|y^i, z^i), q_i^n(\cdot|z^i)). \quad (7.6)$$

In analogy with the Markov kernel $G : \mathcal{X}^n \mapsto \mathcal{X}^n$, defined by (4.1), we can define the Markov kernel

$$G_i^n(\cdot|z^i, \cdot) : \mathcal{X}^{n-i} \mapsto \mathcal{X}^{n-i},$$

using the local specifications of $q_i^n(\cdot|z^i)$:

$$G_i^n(v_i^n|z^i, u_i^n) = \prod_{j=i+1}^n Q_j(v_j|z^i, u_i^{j-1}, v_j^n).$$

I.e., the action of the Markov kernel $G_i^n(\cdot|z^i, \cdot)$ given condition u_i^n is the same as that of the Markov kernel G , given condition (z^i, u_i^n) , restricted to coordinates $i \leq j \leq n$.

For z^i fixed, $q_i^n(\cdot|z^i)$ satisfies the contractivity bound (3.8(C)). Thus by Lemma 7.2, the Markov kernel $G_i^n(\cdot|z^i)$ is a contraction with respect to the W^2 -distance, with at most the rate obtained for G . Thus we get the following bound for (7.6):

$$\begin{aligned} & W^2(\text{dist}(Y_i^n(t)|y^i, z^i), q_i^n(\cdot|z^i)) \\ & \leq C(\delta) \cdot W^2\left(\text{dist}(Y_i^n(t)|y^i, z^i), \text{dist}(Y_i^n(t)|y^i, z^i) \cdot G_i^n(\cdot|z^i)\right) \end{aligned} \quad (7.7)$$

Consider the (partly random) sequence $(z^i, Y_i^n(t))$, and let $\mu^n(\cdot|y^i, z^i)$ denote its conditional distribution:

$$\mu^n(\cdot|y^i, z^i) = \text{dist}(z^i, Y_i^n(t)|z^i).$$

(The marginal of $\mu^n(\cdot|y^i, z^i)$ for the coordinates up to i is concentrated on z^i .) We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}(Y_i^n(t)|y^i, z^i) \\ & = \text{marginal of } \text{dist}(Y^n(t-1)|y^i, z^i) \cdot G \quad \text{for coordinates } i < j \leq n, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}(Y_i^n(t)|y^i, z^i) \cdot G_i^n(\cdot|z^i) \\ &= \text{marginal of } \mu^n(\cdot|y^i, z^i) \cdot G \quad \text{for coordinates } i < j \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & W^2(\text{dist}(Y_i^n(t)|y^i, z^i), \text{dist}(Y_i^n(t)|y^i, z^i) \cdot G_i^n(\cdot|z^i)) \\ & \leq W^2(\text{dist}(y^i, Y_i^n(t-1)|y^i, z^i), \mu^n(\cdot|y^i, z^i)) \\ & = W^2(\text{dist}(y^i, Y_i^n(t-1)|y^i, z^i), \text{dist}(z^i, Y_i^n(t))|y^i, z^i)) \\ & = \sum_{j=1}^i \rho_j \cdot d^2(y_j, z_j) + W^2(\text{dist}(Y_i^n(t-1)|y^i, z^i), \text{dist}(Y_i^n(t)|y^i, z^i)). \end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

Substituting (7.8) into (7.7):

$$\begin{aligned} & W^2(\text{dist}(Y_i^n(t)|y^i, z^i), q_i^n(\cdot|z^i)) \\ & \leq C(\delta) \cdot \left[\sum_{j=1}^i \rho_j \cdot d^2(y_j, z_j) + W^2(\text{dist}(Y_i^n(t-1)|y^i, z^i), \text{dist}(Y_i^n(t)|y^i, z^i)) \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{7.9}$$

To estimate the second term in the square bracket in (7.9), we are going to define a good coupling of the conditional distributions

$$\text{dist}(Y_i^n(t-1)|Y^i(t-1) = y^i, Z^i(t) = z^i) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{dist}(Y_i^n(t)|Y^i(t-1) = y^i, Z^i(t) = z^i). \tag{7.10}$$

(This requires a tedious argument, since for $\text{dist}(Y^n(t-1), Y^n(t))$, as we have defined it, $\mathbb{E} d d n(Y^n(t-1), Y^n(t))$ does *not* tend to 0.) We define a joint distribution

$$\text{dist}(\eta^n(t-1), \eta_i^n(t), \zeta^i(t)) \tag{7.11}$$

that will satisfy

$$\text{dist}(\eta^n(t-1), \zeta^i(t)) = \text{dist}(Y^n(t-1), Z^i(t)) \tag{7.12}$$

and

$$\text{dist}(\eta^i(t-1), \eta_i^n(t), \zeta^i(t)) = \text{dist}(Y^i(t-1), Y_i^n(t), Z^i(t)). \tag{7.13}$$

By (7.12) and (7.13),

$$\text{dist}(\eta_i^n(t-1), \eta_i^n(t)|\eta^i(t-1), \zeta^i(t)) \tag{7.14}$$

will realize the desired coupling of the conditional distributions (7.10).

We define the joint distribution (7.11) as follows. First we define $\text{dist}(\eta^n(t-1), \eta_i^n(t))$. Put $\text{dist}(\eta^n(t-1)) = \text{dist}(Y^n(t-1))$, and define recursively for $i < k \leq n$

$$\text{dist}(\eta_k(t)|\eta^{k-1}(t-1), \eta_k^n(t)) = Q_k(\cdot|\eta^{k-1}(t-1), \eta_k^n(t)). \quad (7.15)$$

Then define

$$\text{dist}(\eta_k(t-1), \eta_k(t)|\eta^{k-1}(t-1), \eta_k^n(t))$$

as that coupling of

$$\text{dist}(\eta_k(t-1)|\eta^{k-1}(t-1), \eta_k^n(t)) \quad \text{and} \quad Q_k(\cdot|\eta^{k-1}(t-1), \eta_k^n(t))$$

that achieves W^2 -distance for all values of conditions. Thereby we have defined

$$\text{dist}(\eta_k(t)|\eta^k(t-1), \eta_k^n(t))$$

for all $i < k \leq n$. Postulating

$$\eta_k(t) \rightarrow (\eta^k(t-1), \eta_k^n(t)) \rightarrow \eta_k^n(t-1),$$

we have defined

$$\text{dist}(\eta^n(t-1), \eta_i^n(t)). \quad (7.16)$$

Observe that we have

$$\text{dist}(\eta^k(t-1), \eta_k^n(t)) = \text{dist}(Y^k(t-1), Y_k^n(t)) \quad i < k \leq n. \quad (7.17)$$

The distance-entropy inequality (1.3(DE)), together with (7.17), implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i < j \leq n} \rho_j \cdot \mathbb{E} d^2(\eta_j(t-1), \eta_j(t)) \\ & \leq 2 \cdot \sum_{i < j \leq n} D(\eta_j(t-1)|\eta^{j-1}(t-1), \eta_j^n(t) || Q_j(\cdot|\eta^{j-1}(t-1), \eta_j^n(t))) \\ & = 2 \cdot \sum_{i < j \leq n} D(Y_j(t-1)|Y^{j-1}(t-1), Y_j^n(t) || Q_j(\cdot|Y^{j-1}(t-1), Y_j^n(t))). \end{aligned} \quad (7.18)$$

Now we extend the joint distribution (7.16) to the joint distribution (7.11), setting

$$\text{dist}(\eta^i(t-1), \eta_i^n(t), \zeta^i(t)) = \text{dist}(Y^i(t-1), Y_i^n(t), Z^i(t)) \quad (7.19)$$

and

$$\zeta^i(t) \rightarrow (\eta^i(t-1), \eta_i^n(t)) \rightarrow \eta_i^n(t-1). \quad (7.20)$$

(7.19-7.20) imply (7.12). (7.19-7.20) also imply (7.13), using the Markov relation

$$Z^i(t) \rightarrow (Y^i(t-1), Y_i^n(t)) \rightarrow Y_i^n(t-1)$$

(the analog of (7.20) for $\text{dist}(Y^n(t-1), Y_i^n(t), Z^i(t))$).

Thus we have

$$\int W^2(\text{dist}(Y_i^n(t-1)|y^i, z^i), \text{dist}(Y_i^n(t)|y^i, z^i)) \leq \sum_{i < j \leq n} \mathbb{E} \rho_j \cdot d^2(\eta_j(t-1), \eta_j(t)), \quad (7.21)$$

where the integration is with respect to $\text{dist}(Y^i(t-1), Z^i(t))$.

Substituting (7.21) into (7.9), and integrating with respect to $\text{dist}(Y^i(t-1), Z^i(t))$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int W^2(\text{dist}(Y_i^n(t)|y^i, z^i), q_i^n(\cdot|z^i)) \\ & \leq C(\delta) \cdot \left[\sum_{j=1}^i \rho_j \cdot \mathbb{E} d^2(Y_j(t-1), Z_j(t)) + \sum_{i < j \leq n} \rho_j \mathbb{E} d^2(\eta_j(t-1), \eta_j(t)) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.22)$$

Substituting (7.18) into (7.22):

$$\begin{aligned} & \int W^2(\text{dist}(Y_i^n(t)|y^i, z^i), q_i^n(\cdot|z^i)) \\ & \leq C(\delta) \cdot \left[\sum_{j=1}^i \rho_j \cdot \mathbb{E} d^2(Y_j(t-1), Z_j(t)) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + 2 \cdot \sum_{i < j \leq n} D(Y_j(t-1)|Y^{j-1}(t-1), Y_j^n(t)) \| Q_j(\cdot|Y^{j-1}(t-1), Y_j^n(t)) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.23)$$

By the distance-entropy bound, the right-hand-side of (7.23) is

$$\leq 4 \cdot C(\delta) \cdot E_t \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus we have found a coupling of the distributions (7.4) such that the integral (7.5) tends to 0, and therefore so do (7.2) and (7.1). Lemma 7.1 is proved.

REFERENCES

- [Ba-E] D. Bakry, M. Emery, *Diffusions hypercontractives*, Séminaire de Probabilités, XIX. Lecture Notes in Math. 1123, Springer, 1985, pp. 177-206.
- [Bar-C-R] F. Barthe, P. Cattiaux, C. Roberto, *Interpolated inequalities between exponential and Gaussian, Orlicz hypercontractivity and isoperimetry*, Rev. Math. Iber. (2005).
- [B-Z] B. Zegarlinski, S. G. Bobkov, *Entropy bounds and isoperimetry*, vol. 829, American Math. Soc., 2005.
- [B-G-L] S. Bobkov, I. Gentil, M. Ledoux, *Hypercontractivity of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **80** (2001), 669-696.
- [Bod-He] Th. Bodineau, B. Helffer, *On Log-Sobolev inequalities for unbounded spin systems*, Funct. Anal. **166**, (1999), 168-178.

- [CE-Ga-Hou] D. Cordero-Erausquin, W. Gangbo, C. Houdré, *Inequalities for generalized entropy and optimal transportation Recent advances in the theory and applications of mass transport*, *Contemp. Math* **353** (2004), American Math. Soc., 73-94.
- R.L. Dobrushin, *Prescribing a system of random variables by conditional distributions*, *Theory of Prob. Appl.* **15** (1970), 453-486.
- [Gui-Z] A. Guionnet, B. Zegarlinski, *Lectures on logarithmic Sobolev inequalities*, Séminaire de probabilités de Strassbourg, **36** (2002), 1-134.
- [Gr] L. Gross, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities*, *Amer. J. Math.* **97** (1975), 1061-1083.
- [He] B. Helffer, *Remarks on decay of correlation and Witten-Laplacians III. Application to logarithmic Sobolev inequalities*, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré*, **35**, (1999), 483-508.
- [Ho-S] R. Holley, D. Stroock, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities and stochastic Ising models*, *J. Statist. Phys.* **16** (1987), 1159-1191.
- [L-P-Y] C. Landim, G. Panizo, H. T. Yau, *Spectral gap and logarithmic Sobolev inequality for unbounded conservative spin systems*, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **38** (2002), 739-777.
- [M1] K. Marton, *Bounding $\bar{d}$ -distance by informational divergence: a method to prove concentration of measure*, *Ann. Probab.* **24**, (1996), 857-866.
- [M2] K. Marton, *Measure concentration for a class of random processes*, *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, **110**, (1998), 427-439.
- [M3] K. Marton, *Measure concentration for Euclidean distance in the case of dependent random variables*, *Ann. Prob.* **32** (2004), 2526-2544.
- [M4] K. Marton, *Correction to the paper "Measure concentration for Euclidean distance in the case of dependent random variables"*, *Annals of Probability*, vol. 32, No 3B, pp. 2526-2544, 2004., *Ann. Prob.*, to appear.
- [N] E. Nelson, *The free Markov field*, *J. Funct. Anal.* **12** (1973), 211-277.
- [O-V] F. Otto, C. Villani, *Generalization of an inequality by Talagrand and links with the logarithmic Sobolev inequality*, *J. Funct. Anal.* **173** (2000), 361-400.
- [R-Z] C. Roberto, B. Zegarlinski, *Orlicz-Sobolev inequalities for sub-Gaussian measures and ergodicity of Markov semigroups*, preprint (2005).
- [S-Z1] D. Stroock, B. Zegarlinski, *The logarithmic Sobolev inequality for continuous spin systems on a lattice*, *J. Funct. Anal.* **104** (1992), 299-326.
- [S-Z2] D. Stroock, B. Zegarlinski, *The logarithmic Sobolev inequality for discrete spin systems on a lattice*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **149** (1992), 175-193.
- [S-Z3] D. Stroock, B. Zegarlinski, *The equivalence of the logarithmic Sobolev inequality and the Dobrushin-Shlosman mixing condition*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **144** (1992), 303-323.
- [T] M. Talagrand, *Transportation cost for Gaussian and other product measures*, *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, **6**, (1996), 587-600.
- [V] C. Villani, *Topics in optimal transportation*, *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, vol. 58, American Math. Soc., 2003.
- [Y] N. Yoshida, *The equivalence of the logarithmic Sobolev inequality and a mixing condition for unbounded spin systems on the lattice*, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Prob. Stat.*, **37**, (2001), 223-243.
- [Z1] B. Zegarlinski, *Dobrushin's uniqueness theorem and logarithmic Sobolev inequalities*, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **105**, (1992), 77-111.
- [Z2] B. Zegarlinski, *The strong decay to equilibrium in the stochastic dynamics of unbounded spin systems on a lattice*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **175**, (1996), 401-432.
- [Z3] B. Zegarlinski, *Isoperimetry for Gibbs measures*, *Annals of Prob.* **29** (2001), 802-819.